

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 16-18, 21-23, 26-28, 30, and 31 are pending, in which claims 33 and 34 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 6, 11-13, 16, 21-23, 26, 28, 30 and 31 are currently amended. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29 and 32 were previously canceled.

The Office Action mailed June 19, 2006 rejected claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 16-18, 21-23, 26-28, 30, 31, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Dillon et al.* (US 6,658,463) or *Chatterjee et al.* (US 6,947,440). Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response to the § 101 rejection, Applicants have amended claims 21-23 to recite a “computer-readable **storage** medium.”

To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26 and 30 to further define the Domain Name System (DNS) process between a host resolver and a name server. For example, independent claim 1, now recites “receiving a **Domain Name System (DNS) query**, at a terminal, from a local **host resolver** requesting address information” and “**forwarding the query** over a wide area network via a satellite **to a remote computer system that is configured as a name server to retrieve the address information.**”

By contrast, the *Dillon et al.* system utilizes proxy servers to cache URLs associated with content, such as HTML document, graphic image, video clip, etc. (col. 1: 47-57). Requests for content associated with URLs are not DNS queries. Moreover, none of the proxy servers are disclosed as behaving as a name server.

Chatterjee et al. is likewise lacking in disclosure of the claimed features. The Office Action, on page 5 (item 5.1), explains that the *Chatterjee et al.* system requests for web pages and objects. Clearly, these cannot be construed as DNS queries. Also, the multicast transmission relate to the caching of these web pages and objects, not DNS entries. At best, *Chatterjee et al.* designates a VSAT hub 128 (Fig. 1b) to receive DNS queries for a remote station 120 that is served by a remote VSAT 123; there is no mention that the station 120 behaves as a host resolver. For instance *Chatterjee et al.*, within col. 7: 24-53, discloses the following (Emphasis Added):

When one or more **Web pages and/or associated objects**, such as Microsoft™, Yahoo™ and/or Netscape™ home pages, **are frequently requested by a plurality of terminal stations**, the present invention **updates caches associated with a plurality of terminal devices using, for example, multicast protocols** that allow for efficient transmission of cache data over a satellite network. Details of a multicast transmission system in accordance with the present invention will be described below.

When a local cache in a remote station 120 does not include a requested page and the objects associated with the requested page, normally a request is then made to Internet 104 for retrieving the necessary data. **A request for a domain name server (DNS) look-up can be made from a remote station 120 to VSAT hub 128.** According to the invention, **VSAT hub 128 can optionally store a version of the DNS tables in cache engine 129 to immediately return the IP address for the desired web server to the requesting remote station 120.** When a locally stored DNS table is available at VSAT hub 128, an immediate look-up is executed. When a DNS table is located remotely from VSAT hub 128, VSAT hub 128 requests the IP address of the desired Web server from the remotely located DNS (not shown in FIGS. 1A and 1B in a well-known manner. In either event, VSAT hub 128 initiates the request for the desired web page directly to the retrieved IP address for obtaining and returning the base page to the requesting remote station. Thus, the delay of transmitting the IP address across the satellite from the remote station and receiving the request back is substantially reduced.

It is evident that neither *Dillon et al.* nor *Chatterjee et al.* teaches the claim feature of a "Domain Name System (DNS) query," particularly in the context of the entire claim. As anticipation requires that all features of the claims be taught in a single reference, the rejections are not sustainable.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (301) 601-7252 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



9-19-2006

Craig L. Plastrik
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,254